

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

MATTHEW H. PETERS, et al.,

Defendant.

No. 2:24-cv-00287 CKD

ORDER

Pending before the Court is Defendants’ Matthew Peters; JMSP, LLC; Paragon Partners, LLC; Innovative Specialty Services, LLC; Cardea Consulting, LLC; Coastline Specialty Services, LLC; Portland Professional Pharmacy, LLC; Sunrise Pharmacy, LLC; Professional 205 Pharmacy, LLC; Lake Forest Pharmacy, LLC; Bayview Specialty Services, LLC; Praxis Marketing Services, LLC; Prestige Professional Pharmacy, LLC; Optimum Care Pharmacy, Inc.; and Glendale Pharmacy, LLC (“Defendants”) motion for reconsideration of the Court’s May 8, 2024 order striking Defendants’ motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 24.)

On May 2, 2024, Defendants’ counsel James Bell filed an *ex parte* pro hac vice application before this Court. (ECF No. 15.) Mr. Bell’s pro hac vice application was rejected by the Clerk’s Office for failure to pay the application fee. (*Id.*) On May 2, 2024, a notice by the Clerk’s Office was sent to Mr. Bell notifying him of the reasons his pro hac vice application was rejected with instructions on how to resubmit the application to practice in this Court. Mr. Bell

1 did not resubmit his application, however, and has now advised the court that he is, in fact,
2 already admitted to practice in this District.¹ Therefore, having reviewed Defendants' pleading,
3 along with the attached exhibit confirming Mr. Bell's admission to practice in this Court, (ECF
4 No. 24 at Exh. A), the Court finds good cause to vacate its May 7, 2024, order.

5 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 6 1. Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 24) is GRANTED;
- 7 2. The order issued on May 7, 2024 (ECF No. 23) is VACATED; and
- 8 3. Within fourteen (14) days of this order, any party who has yet to submit the
9 Consent/Decline Designation regarding the jurisdiction of the magistrate judge shall
10 do so.

11 Dated: May 9, 2024



CAROLYN K. DELANEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12
13
14
15 4, pete0287.24
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 _____
28 ¹ The court notes that all of this confusion could have been avoided had Mr. Bell simply entered
his appearance rather than filing an unnecessary pro hac vice application.